

Clebsch (String) Parameterization of 3-Vectors and Their Actions

S. Deser

Department of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02454, USA

R. Jackiw

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

A.P. Polychronakos

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University, S-75108 Uppsala, Sweden
and Physics Department, University of Ioannina, 45110 Ioannina, Greece*

MIT-CTP # 2992 — Brandeis # BRX TH-476

Abstract

We discuss some properties of the intrinsically nonlinear Clebsch decomposition of a vector field into three scalars in $d = 3$. In particular, we note and account for the incompleteness of this parameterization when attempting to use it in variational principles involving Maxwell and Chern-Simons actions. Similarities with string decomposition of metrics and their actions are also pointed out.

1 Clebsch Decomposition

The decomposition of vectors, as well as higher rank tensors, into irreducible parts is an ancient and extremely useful tool in fluid mechanics, electrodynamics, and gravity. The longitudinal/transverse split separates an arbitrary $d = 3$ Euclidean vector into a scalar plus a transverse vector,

$$\mathbf{A} \equiv \mathbf{A}^L + \mathbf{A}^T = \nabla \lambda + \nabla \times \mathbf{W}^T, \quad (1)$$

the vector $\mathbf{W}^T$ being defined up to a gradient. This linear orthogonal (upon spatial integration) parameterization naturally decomposes the 3-vector $\mathbf{A}$ into two, with 1 and 2 components, respectively. The completeness of $(\nabla \lambda, \mathbf{W}^T)$ in representing $\mathbf{A}$ is evidenced by their uniqueness and invertibility (up to zero modes); in particular, any variational principle yields the same Euler-Lagrange system whether we vary $\mathbf{A}$ or first decompose it and then vary $(\lambda, \mathbf{W}^T)$ separately. It is easy to check that since the field strength is

$$\mathbf{B} \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = -\nabla^2 \mathbf{W}^T, \quad (2)$$

the Chern-Simons (first used physically in [1]) and Maxwell actions

$$I_{CS} = \frac{1}{2} \mu \int \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} = -\frac{1}{2} \mu \int (\nabla \times \mathbf{W}^T) \cdot (\nabla^2 \mathbf{W}^T) \quad I_M = -\frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{B}^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int (\nabla^2 \mathbf{W}^T)^2, \quad (3)$$

vary with A into

$$\delta I_{CS} / \delta \mathbf{A} = \mu \mathbf{B}, \quad \delta I_M / \delta \mathbf{A} = \nabla \times \mathbf{B} \quad (4)$$

which agrees completely with the variations of (3) with respect to $(\lambda, \mathbf{W}^T)$. The extra curl that appears upon varying $\mathbf{W}^T$ does not lose information: the curl is not a projector in the space of transverse functions.

Another ancient parameterization, due to Clebsch [2], has long been used in fluid mechanics [3], but is less familiar elsewhere. This decomposition is strikingly different – it involves only scalars rather than vectors and is nonlinear:

$$\mathbf{A} = \nabla\omega + \epsilon^{ab}\phi_a\nabla\phi_b = \nabla\omega' + 2\phi_1\nabla\phi_2, \quad \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \epsilon^{ab}\nabla\phi_a \times \nabla\phi_b. \quad (5)$$

The representations (1) and (5) share the pure gauge longitudinal term, but the role of $\mathbf{W}^T$ has been assumed by the pair of scalars ϕ_a , $a=1,2$; $\epsilon^{ab} = -\epsilon^{ba}$ is the alternating symbol. The construction of these scalars is described in the texts [4]; for the moment we note only that the ϕ_a are not uniquely determined by $\mathbf{A}$ or $\mathbf{B}$, nor can all $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ be put in this form in terms of well-defined scalar functions.

Our main interest is the particularly strange phenomenon (not hitherto noted to our knowledge), that the Clebsch decomposition (5) is incomplete in the very concrete sense that it fails (differently for each), when inserted into the two actions of (3) and varied with respect to (ω, ϕ_a) , to give the field equations (4) implied by the generic $\mathbf{A}$ -variations. The formal source of this incompleteness may be traced by comparing the decompositions (1) and (5),

$$\nabla^2\lambda = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = \nabla^2\omega + \epsilon^{ab}\phi_a\nabla^2\phi_b, \quad -\nabla^2\mathbf{W}^T = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \epsilon^{ab}\nabla\phi_a \times \nabla\phi_b. \quad (6)$$

Note the demand of (6) that the curl of $\mathbf{A}$ be expressible as the cross-product of two gradients: the curl must then lie on the line orthogonal to the plane they define. It follows that the Chern-Simons action becomes a pure surface term,

$$\int \mathbf{A} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \int \nabla\omega \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \int \nabla \cdot (\omega \nabla \times \mathbf{A}). \quad (7)$$

In $\omega = 0$ gauge, $\mathbf{A}$ is locally orthogonal to $\mathbf{B}$, and in any gauge the bulk integral of (7) vanishes¹. *A fortiori*, the variation of I_{CS} with respect to (ω, ϕ_a) is trivial. Pure Chern-Simons dynamics here reduces entirely to the boundary², rather than defining the (trivially $\mathbf{B}=0$) behavior in the bulk.

Variation of the Maxwell action is also incomplete:

$$-\delta\frac{1}{2}\int \mathbf{B}^2 \equiv -\int \mathbf{B} \cdot \epsilon^{cd}(\nabla\phi_c \times \nabla\delta\phi_d), \quad (8)$$

resulting in the pair of Euler-Lagrange equations

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \cdot \nabla\phi_a \equiv \nabla \cdot (\phi_a \nabla \times \mathbf{B}) = 0, \quad a = 1, 2. \quad (9)$$

¹When the volume integral of $\mathbf{A} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ is nonzero, its entire contribution in the Clebsch parameterization for $\mathbf{A}$ must come from surface terms. Consequently, the Clebsch potentials ω, ϕ_a must be ill behaved, either in the finite volume or at infinity, so that the surface integrals do not vanish. For an example and further details, see [5]

²In this respect, when CS is used as the “helicity” in magnetohydrodynamics, it bears a resemblance to gravitational energy; there is no sensible local (gauge invariant) density, but a perfectly well defined integral over the boundary.

That is, $\nabla \times \mathbf{B}$, like $\mathbf{B}$ itself, is orthogonal to the plane defined by $(\nabla\phi_a)$: the field equation is then

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} + \mu(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{B} = 0 . \quad (10)$$

The function of integration, $\mu(\mathbf{r})$, is constrained by the transversality of $(\mathbf{B}, \nabla \times \mathbf{B})$ in (10) to have its gradient orthogonal to them both: $\nabla\mu$ must lie in the $(\nabla\phi_a)$ plane.

The indeterminacies in the two variational principles are rather different: from I_{CS} , there is no field equation at all; this is in fact traceable to the Darboux incompleteness of the Clebsch decomposition [6], which rests on the triviality of the bulk contribution to I_{CS} that it imposes¹. From the Maxwell action, we obtain only the direction of $\nabla \times \mathbf{B}$. Indeed, any gauge invariant action $I[\mathbf{B}]$ will provide the same form

$$[\nabla \times \delta I / \delta \mathbf{B}(x)] \cdot \nabla \phi_a = 0 , \quad (11)$$

and hence allow the same indeterminate $\mu(r)\mathbf{B}$ addition, subject to $\nabla\mu \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$.

The topologically massive-like [7] ‘‘Maxwell’’ equation (10) is quite unusual: Consider (9) in ‘‘covariant’’ notation,

$$(\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu})\partial_\mu \phi^a \equiv \partial_\mu (\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \phi^a) = 0 \quad (12)$$

whose solution is

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \phi^a = \epsilon^{\nu\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha Z_\beta^a \quad (13)$$

where Z_α^a are two arbitrary transverse 3-vectors. This means in turn that there are two (conserved) ‘‘currents’’, for example, $j^\mu = (\phi_b \phi^b)^{-1} \phi_a \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha Z_\beta^a$. Equations (9,10) and (12,13) present the field equations in two equivalent ways. If we instead introduce the explicit form (6) into (9), we get two (cubic) equations in ϕ alone,

$$\partial_\nu [\epsilon^{bc} \phi^b (\partial_{\mu\nu}^2 - \delta_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2) \phi^c] \partial_\mu \phi^a = 0 . \quad (14)$$

A nonabelian generalization of the Clebsch decomposition has recently been suggested [9]. It shares the abelian property that the CS term is a pure divergence and a similar degeneracy in the field equations occurs. The basic mechanism in both cases is that the variation of an action with respect to the initial variable, here A_μ or its color generalization, is to be multiplied by $\delta A_\mu / \delta \omega$, $\delta A_\mu / \delta \phi^a$. The degenerate contributions noted above again occur as a result of the ϕ^a variations.

It is amusing to compare the Clebsch vector decomposition to the ‘‘string-embedding’’ partition of a 2-tensor [8], available in any dimension d ,

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x) = y_\mu^A(x) y_\nu^B(x) \eta_{AB} , \quad y_\mu^A \equiv \partial_\mu y^A . \quad (15)$$

The scalar string variables y^A , with the index A ranging over $1, \dots, \frac{1}{2}d(d+1)$, are now the independent ones. Inserting this decomposition into the Einstein action (or indeed any other covariant one) and varying the y^A ,

$$\delta I = \int G^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} / \delta y_A \delta y_A \equiv - \int D_\mu D_\nu (G^{\mu\nu} y^A) \delta y^A \quad (16a)$$

(where $G^{\mu\nu} \equiv \delta I / \delta g_{\mu\nu}$ is the necessarily identically conserved “Einstein” tensor density of the action $I[g]$) gives Euler-Lagrange equations very similar to the “weak Maxwell” ones, in terms of the covariant derivative $D_\mu(g)$

$$G^{\mu\nu}(g(y))D_\mu D_\nu y^A = 0 . \quad (16b)$$

These are much weaker [8] than³ $G^{\mu\nu} = 0$. In both vector and tensor cases, the problem is with the derivative nature of a parameterization by scalars: the equally nonlinear *vielbein* decomposition of the metric $g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \eta_{ab}$ into the set of vectors $(e_\mu)^a$ is of course perfectly acceptable (if the *vielbeins* are invertible). Also true of both the Clebsch and the tensor decompositions is the inaccessibility of weak field, linearized, theory from these nonlinear parameterizations, unlike the (invertible) *vielbein* choice, where there is a vacuum possibility $e_\mu^a = \delta_\mu^a$ about which to expand.

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant PHY99-73935 and US Department of Energy (DOE) contract # DE-FC02-94ER40818.

References

- [1] L. Woltier, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **44** (1958) 489.
- [2] A. Clebsch, J. Reine Angew. Math. **56** (1859) 1.
- [3] See for example, M. Berger and G. Field, J. Fluid Mech. **147** (1984) 133; H. Moffat and A. Tsinober, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. **24** (1992) 281; V. Arnold and B. Khesin, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics* (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- [4] H. Lamb, *Hydrodynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1932) p. 248.
- [5] R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 105015; hep-th/9911072.
- [6] See for example, S. Sternberg, *Lectures on Differential Geometry* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1964).
- [7] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Ann. Phys. **140** (1982) 372.
- [8] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim in *Proceedings Marcel Grossmann Meeting*, R. Ruffini, ed. (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1977) p. 75 ; S. Deser, D.C. Robinson and F.A.E. Pirani, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3302.
- [9] R. Jackiw, V.P. Nair and S.-Y. Pi, preprint hep-th/0004084.

³One might conjecture that a quantity similar to the Chern-Simons form becomes degenerate in the metric case, for example, that yielding the Cotton tensor (see [7]) in $d = 3$. The absence of CS generalizations in even d may account for the lack of a higher d Clebsch representation for vectors. For odd d , the extension of (5), $A = \nabla\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{d-2} \phi_i \nabla\phi_{i+1}$, trivializes the corresponding CS $\sim A \cdot F_1 \cdots F_{d-2}$.